

FLASH

PRECEDENCE

Exclusively Eyes Only

FOR COMM CENTER USE ONLY

No Objection to Declassification in Full 2010/05/13 : LOC-HAK-507-4-19-4 :- [B1461]

FROM: THE SITUATION ROOM
TO: GOMPERT/RODMAN FOR THE
SECRETARY/GENERAL SCOWCROFT

INFO:

DEX _____
DAC 016 GPS _____
LDX _____ PAGES 3
TTY _____ CITE _____

DTG: 311820Z

TOR: 311830Z

RELEASED BY:

ED

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

TOHAK

76

1975 MAY 31 18 19

WHITE HOUSE
SITUATION ROOM

75 MAY 31 PM 2 40

ON-FILE NSC RELEASE INSTRUCTIONS
APPLY

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE
EXCLUSIVELY EYES ONLY

TOHAK

76

May 31, 1975

TO: GOMPERT/RODMAN for SCOWCROFT/KISSINGER

FROM: BUD MCFARLANE *RCm*

1. The following oral message has just been delivered by
Yuri Babenko.

2. Begin text. (Quote attached .) End text.

3. Warm regards.

Received as my in Tarkenton
1:50 p.m., Sat. May 31, 1975
oral message
from L. I. Brezhnev

Dear Mr. President,

My colleagues and I deem it necessary to approach you in connection with some statements made recently by officials of the United States.

First of all it concerns a statement by the US Secretary of Defence Mr. Schlessinger about possible use by the United States of nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union and other member-states of the Warsaw Treaty.

How do we have to understand this official statement made by the US Secretary of Defence to the Congress of the United States? In the Basic Principles of relations between the USSR and the US signed in 1972 during the first Soviet-American summit meeting both sides declared that they will do their utmost to avoid military confrontations and to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. Then in 1973 our two countries concluded a special Agreement on prevention of nuclear war by which the Soviet Union and the United States pledged to act in such a way as to exclude the outbreak of nuclear war between them and between each of the parties and other countries.

It is obvious that the abovementioned statement of the US Secretary of Defence in no way corresponds neither to those solemn obligations taken by our countries, nor to numerous statements that followed about determination of both sides to continue the course at relaxation of tension and at strengthening peace, nor, finally, to the spirit of our talks with you in Vladivostok.

Nothing is changed by a reference in the US Secretary of Defence's statement to some hypothetical possibility of a Soviet attack on Western Europe with the use of conventional forces. A question arises who and why needs this fiction kindred to detective

stories.

We are bewildered, Mr. President, by this fact. And, of course, it would be good to clarify the real sense of those statements and the aims they pursue.

I would not be completely frank if I did not tell you, Mr. President, that we were surprised also by some phrases contained according to the Western press in your speech before the Council of NATO in Brussels. Quite recently you correctly answered to the opponents of the policy of relaxation of tension that this relaxation is necessary and advantageous to all countries, that it serves their common interests - the preservation of peace. Yet now, if to believe the reports of the press, you call upon your partners in NATO to work out such a program of relaxation which would serve only the interests of NATO countries but not the interests of others, who adhere to other ideals. But this is precisely the very onesided interpretation of the policy of relaxation - yet in the opposite direction - which you rightly rejected yourself. And in this connection also certain questions arise.

I would be grateful to you, Mr. President, if you could share your thoughts with us on the questions I have touched upon.